UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The War and The Christian Century
M. C. Otto

Freedom for Devotion - - *Edith Hansen*

The Future of Organized Religion - - - - - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Moisés Sáenz, Mexican Educator - - - - - - - - - *John H. Hershey*

Humanism and Moral Leadership - - - - - - - *Edwin H. Wilson*

Is a Democratic Collectivism Possible? - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 12

Chicago, February, 1943

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Edith Hansen: Homemaker; daughter of a Congregational minister; wife of a research chemist.

John H. Hershey: Minister of First Congregational Society in West Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Leo Hirsch: A graduate of New York University; chairman for many years of Business Men's Group founded in collaboration with Felix Adler; former lecturer under auspices of the William Allen White Committee.

M. C. Otto: Professor of Philosophy, University of Wisconsin; author of *Things and Ideals, The Human Enterprise,* and other works.

Edwin H. Wilson: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Schenectady, New York; editor of *The Humanist.*

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and free lance writer.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.....179
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.....181

ARTICLES—

The War and The Christian Century—M. C. OTTO.....182
Freedom for Devotion—EDITH HANSEN.....184
The Future of Organized Religion—LEO HIRSCH.....186
Voices of Latin America—I—Moisés Sáenz, Mexican Educator—JOHN H. HERSHEY.....188
Humanism and Moral Leadership—EDWIN H. WILSON.....189
Is a Democratic Collectivism Possible?—VICTOR S. YARROS.....190

THE STUDY TABLE—

Tragedy Speaks for Itself—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.....191
This Man William James—KENNETH L. PATTON.....192

THE FIELD—

Civil Liberties—*A.C.L.U. Bulletin*

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Civil Liberties

The U. S. Supreme Court last week granted the request of the State of West Virginia for a review of the decision of a three judge federal court last October voiding a state flag-salute law as applied to children with religious scruples.

A review of this decision will necessarily involve a reconsideration of the Supreme Court's own decision in 1940 in the Gobitis case, in which local compulsory flag-salute requirements were upheld. In nullifying the West Virginia statute, the lower court justified its refusal to follow the Gobitis decision by pointing out that of the seven Supreme Court judges now sitting who participated in the Gobitis decision four have stated their disagreement with it. One of the four was Chief Justice Stone who alone dissented in the original case. The others are Justices Black, Douglas, and Murphy who took occasion to "confess their error" in a dissent last June in a 5-to-4 decision sustaining local taxes on the sale of religious literature.

The A.C.L.U. will participate in the Supreme Court case by filing a brief. A new point is involved by the passage by Congress last June of a national flag-salute law which requires only standing at attention. Jehovah's Witnesses do not regard such a requirement as violating religious scruples.

. . . . . .

A new pamphlet, "Jehovah's Witnesses and the War," published by the national office of the American Civil Liberties Union is now available for distribution from the Union's headquarters, 170 Fifth Ave., New York City.

A foreword to the pamphlet signed by some of the nation's leading clergymen says that

> . . . this extraordinary record of wartime attacks upon the liberties of a religious organization constitutes a challenge to democratic liberties and religious tolerance. . . . .
>
> It is in the interests of religious tolerance and reasonable solutions that the undersigned—wholly dissociated from any connection with or endorsement of Jehovah's Witnesses—subscribe to the publication of this pamphlet and commend it to the attention of all liberty-loving Americans.

Among the signers are Bishop James Chamberlain Baker, Los Angeles; Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, New York; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York; Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York; Rt. Rev. Walter Mitchell, Arizona; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Boston; Rev. Dr. De Sola Pool, New York; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, Washington, D. C.

—*A.C.L.U. Bulletin.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII FEBRUARY, 1943 No. 12

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

The world is beset by an agony of woe this day which I believe to be greater than any ever hitherto encountered by mankind. Sorokin, in his great book, *The Crisis of Our Age,* calls this "the bloodiest crisis of the bloodiest century." If, in any previous age, there has been a vaster or deeper agony, then men generally have not known it, since until our time there has been no nervous system of news communication to record and transmit it. We know and feel today the maximum of horror. How to live from hour to hour under such stress of pain is perhaps our most dreadful problem. And I know of no answer to it except in the finding and doing of some work immediately related to the woe that now besieges us. Here the men in the army and the navy and other branches of governmental service are to be regarded as fortunate. They have their job to do, their orders to obey. They are absorbed, body, mind and soul, in the big task of the moment. This task is ugly—nobody likes war any more!—but there are millions of persons, inside and outside the armed forces, who simply see no other way of ending the evils that beset us, and their spirits are content. At the opposite pole in this globular struggle are the conscientious objectors to war. They also have their work to do, as prescribed by government in camp or prison, in testimony to the high faith that is within them. Voluntarily, and in the spirit of sacrifice, they are living for what they feel to be best in this great crisis, and therefore have found their place. In between these two extremes, where morale is at its peak, stand the rest of us. What are *we* doing to alleviate the world's agony, and in the end to rescue it from death? It is not enough to wash our hands of what we regard as evil. In no standing aloof and apart can any agony in our own hearts find easement. Somewhere, in this vast welter of distress, we must also find our place and take it, and there do all that in us lies to lift up and save the stricken body of mankind. What one person is doing I may not be physically or spiritually able to do. But something I must do with all my heart and soul. Sacrifice is the call of this black hour. No one has a right to live these days who cannot in one way or another show his personal offering gladly laid upon the altar of humanity. And let not one reproach another that all offerings are not the same! If true in spirit, they are the same with God.

II

The following news dispatches appeared in the American press in December last:

> Special courts at ——— and ——— have sentenced twenty-one persons to death as a result of disorders in August and September.
>
> At ———, eleven persons were sentenced to death and thirteen others to banishment to penal camps for life after conviction on charges of murder and rioting in which a police inspector and another official were killed.
>
> At ———, ten persons were sentenced to death, fifty-two to banishment for life and nine others to various prison terms for arson, looting and murder.

It would seem easy to identify these dispatches as reports of Nazi outrages, until the two spaces in the first dispatch are filled in with the names of Bangalore and Wardha respectively, the space in the second dispatch with Bangalore, and in the third dispatch with Wardha. Then it is seen that they are all stories from India—as a matter of fact, dispatches from New Delhi. They are copied here from the pages of the January issue of the *New History* magazine as disclosing what the editorial comment therein describes as "the nature of political unrest in India." The people of this occupied country in Asia are seething with the same spirit of revolt against tyranny as the people of the occupied countries in Europe. And the revolt in the one place as in the other is being met by very much the same type of repression and punishment. This is not to say that the British are practising the same indiscriminate and nameless cruelties as those of which the Nazis have been so hideously guilty. There are no Lidices in India! But the imposition of imprisonment, banishment to concentration camps, and capital penalties ("sentenced to death") is common to both situations. Conquest and empire, in other words, are everywhere much the same, and must everywhere be got rid of. The expulsion of western colonial powers from Asia and Africa is as necessary as the expulsion of the Axis powers wherever they have gone. All men everywhere must be delivered from alien rule. The recent surrender by Britain and the

United States of extraterritorial rights and privileges in China is good augury for the future. The world will yet be free!

III

It's a good thing that, thanks to the last election, Congress is restored to its rightful place in America's system of government. This Congress, under the Constitution, is a coördinate branch of the government, of equal powers with the Executive, though one never would have known it in the last ten years. In nothing, I believe, will history be more severe on President Roosevelt than on his degradation of Congress—and on Congress itself for consenting to such degradation. The Executive has ridden roughshod over the national legislature, and thus made it—to change the figure!—little better than a rubber stamp. Now Congress is independent again, and thus restored to its true place in the government of the land. All of which is to the good! But this raises the question as to how Congress, with its recaptured powers, is going to behave. And here we have the danger of a reaction more serious than anything the nation has known since the days of President Harding. There are multiplying signs that the Republicans and Bourbon Democrats, who are now in control on Capitol Hill, are proposing to harry the President and his associates, and do everything possible to destroy or at least woefully cripple the great accomplishments of the New Deal. This New Deal, be it said, is vulnerable enough to attack, especially in the field of lavish financial expenditures. But it has also been creative in its statesmenship, and just here is where havoc is likely to be wrought by a standpat bipartisan control of Congress. It takes no especially acute ears to hear the Southern Democrats saying to the Republicans, "We'll keep the Negroes down, if you'll keep labor down"; and the Republicans saying in turn to the Democrats, "We'll help you with the Negroes, if you'll help us with labor!" There's a combination for you, heading right straight up to a post-war Fascism capable of losing everything at home and abroad after the war is won. It is fortunate at just this time, and in anticipation of this deadly peril, that the liberals are beginning to organize a movement, led by ex-Senator Norris, to save America from this deadly tide of political and social reaction. Time is short, and action must be vigorous.

IV

The nationalization, or public ownership, of land has always been regarded as a decidedly radical proposal. But here, under the stress of the war, is the London *Economist,* the famous English financial journal, coming out in favor of nationalization. The *Economist* is thinking not merely of the war but of the peace after the war, and everywhere finds that private ownership and control of the land stand in the way of much needed reforms. How is there to be any constructive planning—how is London, for example, going to be rebuilt according to modern as contrasted with medieval ideas—if everywhere society runs up against the veto of private interest? Right in the war itself we get an idea of what this interest means. Thus, in Russia, we have seen the German invasion met by what is called the "scorched earth" policy. As the Nazi legions advanced into Russian territory, everything was destroyed and the earth left a desert. And this the Soviets were able to do because there were no considerations of private ownership to interfere. The land was all owned by the state, and thus the state was able to do with its own what it would. In contrast to this was what happened in Malaya. The Japanese invasion of this peninsula was even more formidable than the German invasion of Russia. We are now told that the English fell back before the Japanese armies on a pre-arranged schedule of ten miles a day. But, with few exceptions, the land was not touched. Plantations, rubber groves, machinery, buildings, equipment, all fell into the hands of the victors practically unscathed. And the reason is that the planters simply could not bring themselves to destroy their property, and there was no general authority or power to act in the public interest. But peace is more important than war! Here is where planning for the future comes in—and, says the *Economist,* every constructive idea "runs right into the question of private ownership." Deploring the discussion of purely abstract principle, especially now, the *Economist* proposes that the idea of nationalization be accepted, and that an Act be passed asserting the intention of the state eventually to purchase all the land and establishing principles of valuation which would freeze present values. Then, after the war, specific parcels could be taken over by due purchase as planning developed and machinery for management was built up. This perhaps is a part of the new world we hear so much about.

V

Good news! *Good news!!* The fight against "booze" is sweeping on, and registering thumping victories. The very logic of events is fighting, as it usually does, on the side of righteousness. (1) Thus, it is reported that Alaska is going dry this winter. Cargo space for the shipment of liquor to the northern territory is no longer available, and therefore the inhabitants have got to go without. The mothers and fathers and children will rejoice that necessity thus rids them of this plague, but the saloonkeepers, and bawdy-house keepers, and vice brokers generally, to say nothing of the newspapers with their liquor ads, will be in despair. Good citizens in Alaska should take advantage of this situation, and oust "booze" for good. (2) But still better news comes from Canada, where the government has at last recognized the menace of drink of every description to the public welfare, especially in wartime, and is taking

action against it. Thus, Prime Minister Mackenzie has announced that the amount of beverage alcohol released from bond this current year (1943) will be reduced from the previous year "by the following percentages—beer, 10 per cent; wine, 20 per cent; spirits, 30 per cent." In addition, *prohibition of all liquor advertising has been decreed!* These measures have been taken, said the Prime Minister, "as a means of achieving a total war effort." In other words, the liquor business is hampering the war effort. How could it be otherwise, when the use of "booze" in Canada has increased since the outbreak of the war by 37½ per cent for spirits, 25 per cent for wine, and more than 60 per cent for beer? The next step, of course, is to wipe out the liquor business altogether—and the sooner, the better. The wiping out of the advertising is a good beginning. And now, what does this mean for the United States? Is our government going to wake up, or is it going to wait until we have suffered in our factories and army camps, and in society generally, as Canada has suffered? Mr. Roosevelt is of course reluctant to act, as one of the great "triumphs" of his first administration was the repeal of the Prohibition amendment. But the present situation must soon force action. The whole nation, testifies the Cleveland *Press,* is on "a liquor spree." Ohio, according to this same newspaper, has reached an "all-time peak in the consumption of liquor, with many evils riding its flood tide." The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* describes the growing scandal of liquor selling to "teen-age boys and girls." Chicago newspapers report that "more minors obtained liquor than in any previous year." New York is swirling with booze. The time for action is at hand. This liquor debauch must go!

VI

That was a remarkable statement about the churches which was made last month by Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. He was reporting about the state of the churches in this war crisis, and testified that, throughout the nation, the pacifist movement had "tremendous strength." This really should surprise nobody, for the evidence of pacifism in the churches, after Pearl Harbor day exactly as before, has been abundant. Leading preachers in all parts of the country—Fosdick, Chalmers, Buttrick, Lathrop, McKee, Sockman, Scherer, Stamm, Bishop Lawrence, Poteat, Tittle, Palmer, Day—are unshakable in their pacifist position. Conference after conference, many of them representing the leading denominations of the country, has refused to identify Christianity with the war effort—which means that great numbers of laymen as well as ministers are in the pacifist ranks! Assessing the situation after a nation-wide survey, Doctor Johnson declared that the growth of the pacifist movement, in the last two decades, represents "one of the most remarkable features of recent religious history in America." The consequences of this movement seemed to bother Doctor Johnson. He said that it has made "many of the Protestant bodies uncertain, and even ambiguous, in their testimony concerning war." Not at all, Doctor, not at all! Never has the testimony of the churches on the war question been so certain and so clear-cut as it is today. It has not been on the side of the war, to be sure; but on the higher issues of peace, it has been as forthright as that of the early Christians. The churches simply will not identify their destinies with this or any other war—and this is a new phenomenon in modern religious history. Hitherto, especially in the last war, the pacifists were voices crying in the wilderness. Now, in this war, they are a mighty chorus singing like the angel-host on the first Christmastide. Nor will this triumphant pacifist movement be weakened any by the war. On the contrary, it is being strengthened every hour. When the war is over, said Dean Inge the other day, there will come the greatest pacifist revival the world has ever known. And why not? After the last war, the church was hopelessly discredited by its hysterical ferocity during wartime. After this war, it will stand panoplied by its staunch fidelity to the ideals of the Christian spirit. It will have won the confidence of stricken men, and thus will lead the world.

Jottings

The English, the Russians, and the Americans have been magnificent in defeat. Now we are going to learn if they can be equally magnificent in victory.

"The Lord Privy Seal said a few days ago that it was to the fearless leadership of the church that we must look for a Christian solution of the overwhelming problems that will confront us after the war."—*The Christian News-Letter* (London).

Yes!—But let the church really give "fearless leadership," and what do people say? That the church should attend to its own business and leave secular affairs alone! The Lord Privy Seal would be the first to be outraged if the church gave the kind of "fearless leadership" the present crisis demands.

"Anything that's fun is 'out'," says the Fuel Administration in defining the ban on automobile driving in the eastern states. But driving to church on Sunday is all right. This must mean that church-going is not pleasure, but good hard work!

The President's appointment of "Boss" Flynn as Minister to Australia is pretty terrible, no doubt about that, especially for Australia. But there is this to be said for it—that to get "Dear Eddie" out of the country is a public service of the highest order.

Is Mahatma Gandhi an important man today? What other man has had three books published about him in a single month? Note (1) Louis Fischer's *A Week with Gandhi,* (2) T. A. Raman's *What Does Gandhi Want?,* and (3) Anand T. Hingorani's (editor) *My Appeal to the British, by Gandhi.*

Nothing tickles me quite so much in this war as the fact that the American commander in North Africa is named Eisenhower. But why should this good old German name be Anglicized? Why not face the Nazis with General Eisenhauer?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The War and The Christian Century

M. C. OTTO

The series of editorials on the Christian and the War, originally published in *The Christian Century* and now as a book, is a challenge to every thoughtful American. The problem discussed is a crucial human problem, and the solution offered, in so far as it is translated into practical attitudes and deeds, will have significant consequences not only for Christians, but for men and women of other religious faiths and of no religious faith.

The author, Charles Clayton Morrison, says he covets the kind of criticism that "may bring into view aspects of reality and truth which any writer, working alone and with his own thoughts, and under the pressure of a journalistic timetable, may easily overlook." Criticism of his outlook should have been forthcoming in any case. Like Jonathan Edwards and unlike Emerson in a time of revolutionary change, he labors to perpetuate a religious outlook which belongs to the past. He turns away from the possibility of finding a new and larger meaning for religious aspiration in and through the forces that are reshaping the world. Why this preference?

The aim of Mr. Morrison's religious philosophy is to provide an escape from the fatal horns of a dilemma in which he believes the Christian pacifist and, equally with him, the Christian non-pacifist is caught. Each of them wants to do right, and neither of them can. Neither of them can, that is, by adhering to his position. And the escape which Mr. Morrison provides is what he calls Christian Realism, a theological concept which he insists is the one possible basis of a correct understanding of the nature and meaning of the war in which we are engaged. It is this theology which some of us cannot stomach. We cannot keep it down because it is completely out of touch with contemporary knowledge, imperfect as that may be, and because it leaves the men and women in the lurch who are giving themselves body and soul—let it all be a mistake, if you will—to preserve what they regard as the most promising way of life mankind has yet set out upon.

Neither the position of the pacifist, then, nor of the militarist, gets endorsement. "The guilt of the pacifist," we read, "is his severance of himself from the corporate life of his national community in an act which leaves the treasures and the destiny of the community to be preserved by others." At the same time, he cannot actually do what his conscience says he must do. "He cannot—he literally cannot—dissociate himself from the *war.*" In one way or another he will contribute to the fighting no matter how strenuously he tries to keep out of it. But the militarist, too, is in trouble. He remains united with his fellow men in the struggle to protect their country's interests and ideals, but he has to do what he regards as wrong. "His guilt is the guilt which the pacifist tries to escape—the guilt of killing his fellow men." What then?

War having come, there is, according to Christian Realism, no way *out* of it, only a way *through* it. We must see the war as God's judgment upon us for our sins. Non-Christians presumably might reach a different conclusion, but Christians must recognize that God is at work in history, "in every moment of which he is present and actively exercising his sovereign will." He is therefore implicated in the war now going on. "God is omnipresent throughout the war, and actively involved in it himself." He does not, however, will it in the sense of approving or condoning it. "The very thought," says Mr. Morrison, "is a monstrous one." What God is doing is punishing us. "He does not *command* us to fight, he *condemns* us to fight." Our "necessity of fighting is God's judgment upon us for our disobedience to his will." This is the meaning of the war as an historical event. History is "a continuum of conversation between God and man." Every historical event is "a word of God." The present war, correctly understood, is God speaking to us.

Well, what is God saying? As Mr. Morrison hears the message, this is what God is saying. He has called the nations before him and is telling them: "You shall fight and slay your human brothers and be slain by them—this is your punishment. None among you can escape it. My judgment falls, like my rain, upon the just and the unjust—upon those who hate war and shrink from it, no less than those who love war and provoke it. As all are bound in the bundle of life, so all share in the common guilt and all must accept the common necessity, the common tragedy!"

Here we must part company. War is horrible. If war is God's judgment upon men without distinction of guilt, if he condemns even innocent children to a life of misery for crimes they have not committed, then God is more horrible than war. The conscience of the world is shocked by the brutality of military dictators who order the execution of the innocent with the guilty. These dictators have at least the excuse that they are unable to detect the guilty. Mr. Morrison's omniscient God cannot be in a similar predicament. He must there-

fore be the more brutal. No word will do justice to the villainy that wipes out a whole village because some persons in it have deliberately opposed a *human* will. What shall we say when villages, towns, great cities are wiped out because some who dwelt in them have deliberately opposed a *divine* will, if indeed they have knowingly done so?

This is one reason why we reject Mr. Morrison's theological interpretation of the stupendous conflict into which mankind has been plunged. We cannot agree with him when he tells us that our destiny is in the keeping of a Supreme Being who, frustrated by human beings in carrying out his will, "comes down upon their heads" in a universal punishment "sometimes vividly called the 'wrath' of God." The doctrine promulgated in the following words is utterly repugnant to our sense of justice: "We shall not understand what God is saying to us in this war until we reëstablish in our thinking the concept of the wrath of God which modern liberalism has allowed almost to disappear from our Christian vocabulary." No evidence is adduced for the existence of such a divine sovereign. We therefore decline to coöperate in rebrutalizing the religious concept which the gradual humanizing of mankind has rendered more and more humane.

The doctrine is repugnant not only to our sense of justice but to our sense of reality. Was it evil disposition so much as it was ignorance which brought us to the present pass? Was it not primarily a dearth of essential information, clouded understanding, inability to catch the gleam of great civilized ends, and lack of skill in using appropriate means for realizing those we did see? And is it not precisely the kind of philosophy disseminated in this book of editorials which has contributed toward the perpetuation of these shortcomings? Wherever unrealized human potentialities and the unrealized possibilities of the environment have been hopefully and intelligently drawn upon to meliorate the common lot, there life has been made more livable in general, and a step has been taken in social progress. But this tested method of improving the quantity and quality of satisfaction in living has found little favor with certain religious leaders because it is after all a thoroughly human affair.

Mr. Morrison, it seems, prefers this type of religious leader. His theological interpretation is one more formulation of lack of faith in human nature. He throws in his influence with those whose outspoken mistrust of man as man is being spread abroad in more and more unequivocal language.

The mood is of course understandable. There are ugly facts for a contemporary Diogenes to advertise. Deliberate colossal destruction of life, enormous waste of physical and spiritual goods, gigantic grinding up of manhood and womanhood in a vast war machine for the one end of perfecting and intensifying the will to annihilate, all this is a discouraging spectacle. Add the sinister outcropping of underground manipulation to win personal advantage from the general sacrifice; add the accumulating evidence that we may be only at the beginning of a deadly combat for racial and class survival; is there a thoughtful person who faces these disturbing events and is not tormented by the occasional wavering of his faith in human nature?

Still, human nature is all we have to work with. Even those who look to God to redeem the world recognize that he works through human agents. It is always up to human beings to produce a better world. And history shows that this is what they want to do and can do. The vision of a better world has appealed to men universally and they have shown themselves equal to the task of converting the ideal into the actual. They have failed, have failed often, but only to try again. And they are trying today, some blindly, others with a goal clearly before them, to bring nearer the kind of a world they fought to establish twenty-five years ago. When have men and women the world round shown such willingness to make sacrifices, such resourcefulness, such incredible organizing ability? When have good-humored endurance of hardship and courageous loyalty been more conspicuous than in our war-torn world? We have only to learn how these virtues may be employed for constructive ends to usher in a greater moral renaissance than any yet recorded.

This is a lesson it takes time to learn. We shall not learn it faster but more slowly by selecting failures and weaknesses as most truly representing man, and interpreting his failures and weaknesses as crimes. It will not help us forward to put on sackcloth with ashes and to repent of sin. If we are to deal successfully with the stupendous social problems which the war glaringly shows that we have so far failed to master, problems which, moreover, are and will be vastly more difficult because of the war, we shall need all the buoyancy of spirit, all the hopefulness, all the confidence in man's moral and intellectual powers that we can summon to our aid.

Another reason for disagreeing with Mr. Morrison's doctrine is this: looking upon the war as divine punishment is a fruitless way of coping with the desperate situation in which we are involved. A sense of guilt or sin may depress men, may make them feel low-down, worthless, impotent, but it will not lead them to discover and institutionalize a better national and international way of life. And exactly that is what has to be done. Looking inward upon ourselves, repenting of the evils in our natures, may have its own kind of value, but it will leave uncared for the inescapable necessity of designing and applying the instrumentalities required for elevating the moral quality of practical conduct. To meet this necessity our thought has to turn outward.

From the large number of letters received commenting on his war editorials, Mr. Morrison selected one as representative. The writer of this letter contends that "war is but an intensification of the strife which existed in times of 'peace' . . . . What was covert and on a small scale is now overt and pushed to the extremest limits—but it is the same struggle." This criticism, admitted by the author of the book to be pivotal, he disposes of by reasserting his theological thesis. To some of us, however, this correspondent seems entirely right. He is aware at least that opposition to war can only become effective through changing the institutions and processes of day to day living. For we may repent on our knees or flat on our faces, and worse wars will follow this one unless we put into practice, specifically and constructively, a way of life whose natural trend is the encouragement of coöperative behavior. And beyond this nearer necessity lies the task of gathering together far-flung national aims into a feasible plan of world organization, and then learning how to administer a sense of world citizenship in the localized areas where after all innumerable large and small ambitions and hopes must continue to be worked out. This combination of projects calls for every bit of social imagination and practical good sense that we have, possibly for more than we have. What service of greater human

value can religion perform than to help release man's best powers of intellect and feeling for the mastery of these problems?

The motivating conviction of Mr. Morrison cannot of course be lightly brushed aside. War, especially war as now conducted, confronts civilized society with the threat of utter destruction. Both will not survive. And any man deserves our respect who is ready to declare his deep opposition to war in defiance if necessary of public opinion, and who refuses to make his position more palatable than the truth seems to him to allow. But what a message Mr. Morrison sends into our troubled world! It erases the distinction between social idealists and social materialists. It makes illusions out of the ideals for which pacifists and non-pacifists risk what they had hoped for in life. It adds the weight of moral guilt to the burdens which those must bear whose crime is willingness to be blown to bits or to drown in the sea so that the hope of a better world may not die in the human heart.

Possibly theology demands that aspiring human nature be thus let down. Of one thing, however, we may be sure. A religion that lets men down is not a religion to which they will rally. And what shall it profit a religion if it shall gain a theology, and lose mankind?

Freedom for Devotion

EDITH HANSEN

Comments in liberal religious periodicals upon the ruling and dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of the Jehovah's Witnesses, last June, are indicative of the realization by liberal religious leaders that their freedom, as well as that of peculiar, militant sects, is championed in the statements of Chief Justice Stone and Associate Justices Murphy, Black, and Douglas. Ought not this realization to become also an appreciation of the insight into the value of religious devotion revealed in the dissenting opinions? May the devotion of the scientifically blind have intrinsic potential worth which should be recognized and encouraged by the scientifically enlightened? Four members of the Supreme Court see such value in "sincere efforts" to spread religious beliefs that they find in the Constitution special provision for maximum freedom of religious activity.

The Supreme Court reviewed three cases of Jehovah's Witnesses, from Alabama, Arkansas, and Arizona, in which individuals were convicted for selling tracts without paying flat license fees of substantial sums. The Witnesses argued that the taxes were an unconstitutional burden on the rights of free speech and free religion. Five Justices, viewing the cases from the standpoint of expediency, considered whether " a nondiscriminatory license fee, presumably appropriate in amount, may be imposed upon these activities" without violation of the Constitution. "Courts, no more than Constitutions," states the ruling opinion, "can intrude into the consciences of men . . . but courts are competent to adjudge the acts men do under color of a constitutional right. . . . So the mind and spirit of man remain forever free, while his actions rest subject to necessary accommodation to the competing needs of his fellows." Knowledge and discussion are the principal bases of democracy, but the hearing of dissentients "may be limited by action of the proper legislative body to times, places, and methods for the enlightenment of the community which, in view of existing social and economic conditions, are not at odds with the preservation of peace and good order."

> When proponents of religious or social theories use the ordinary commercial methods of sales of articles to raise propaganda funds, it is a natural and proper exercise of the power of the state to charge reasonable fees for the privilege of canvassing. . . . It is difficult to see in such enactments a shadow of prohibition of the exercise of religion or of abridgement of the freedom of speech or of the press.

The attitude of the four dissenting Justices may be summed up in a saying of Richard Whatley: "Nothing but the right can ever be expedient, since that can never be true expediency which would sacrifice a greater good to a less." Maximum freedom of religion, they believe, is a greater good. Chief Justice Stone, in a statement in which Justices Black, Douglas, and Murphy concur, declares that the commands of the First and Fourteenth Amendments, rather than being restricted to protecting freedoms of speech and religion from attack, put them in "a preferred position." These commands "extend at least to every form of taxation which, because it is a condition of the exercise of the privilege, is capable of being used to control or suppress it." "The more humble and needy the cause, the more effective is the suppression." Justice Murphy, with Chief Justice Stone and Justices Black and Douglas concurring, urges "fastidious care" and "precise language" in the framing of ordinances restricting the dissemination of ideas in order "not to impair the substance of those cherished freedoms." The protection of the Constitution must extend "to dissident minorities who energetically spread their beliefs." "Sincere efforts to spread religious beliefs" should not be taxed. "Liberty of conscience is too full of meaning for the individuals in this nation to permit" such prohibition or impairment. "If this Court is to err. . . ., far better that it err in being overprotective of these precious rights."

The three cases are considered with detailed care by the dissenting Justices, all the testimony, including much that had been ignored or held irrelevant, being studied for its full significance. Evasions and subterfuges of the ruling opinion are condemned. A generous view of the cases, sympathetic with the Witnesses as valuable personalities, is presented in contrast to the narrow justification of the ruling opinion accomplished by particularistic distinctions between the cases and the provisions of the Constitution. The conclusion of both dissenting statements is that the activities of the Witnesses, because of their religious purpose, should not be taxed. Chief Justice Stone shows that none of the ordinances could control the time, place, or manner of their activities. None has any discernible relation to police protection or good order. The only purpose is suppression of the distribution of literature in default of payment of a substantial tax. Such taxes are a means for even more effective suppression of speech, press, and religion than the stamp taxes which were "a moving cause of the American Revolution." Justice Murphy points out that there is no suggestion in any of the cases of fraud, obnoxious behavior, public dis-

turbance or inconvenience, contravention of private rights, offense to morals, or danger to organized society. He champions the cause of the Witnesses in spite of "the antagonism generally encountered" by them. He draws "an arresting parallel" between their troubles and the struggles of dissentient groups in the colonies. He deplores the possibility of the further use of such taxes "to suppress the unpalatable views of militant minorities." He urges that "municipalities should not be free to raise general revenue by taxes on the circulation of information and opinion in non-commercial causes; other sources can be found, the taxation of which will not choke off ideas."

Original ideas flow from the free exercise of devotion to concepts and principles. Restriction of freedom for the exercise of devotion results in inhibition of creative thinking, which, in some degree at least, takes place in the minds of ordinary individuals. Present governmental policy tends toward restriction and inhibition. Yet law grows by dissenting, as well as by ruling, opinions of the Supreme Court. Illustrative of this truth is the statement of Justices Black, Douglas, and Murphy, that they have come to believe their position wrong in the former eight-to-one Jehovah's Witnesses decision which upheld a school requirement of saluting the flag. Chief Justice Stone, then dissenting, issued this prophetic opinion:

> The Constitution expresses more than the conviction of the people that democratic processes must be preserved at all costs. It also expresses a faith and a command that freedom of mind and spirit must be preserved, a freedom which government must obey if it is to adhere to that justice and moderation without which no free government can persist.

The ruling opinion of the resent cases shows the influence of this dissenting opinion and definitely acknowledges the influence in the assumption that "there is no occasion to apply here the principles taught by that opinion."

Although the majority of the Supreme Court lag behind their leader in the recognition of religious values, the spirit of true religion nevertheless has taken a step forward. The ruling opinion will be a handicap, but it need not counteract the gain of emphasis upon the importance of devotion. Here lies the challenge to liberal religious leaders. They can aid the advance of the spirit of true religion by giving attention to the impulse for devotion as a common natural resource of the human spirit. Sincere effort or devotion is the one shared trait of religionists. The very intellectual and the simple minded, the reasoning and the highly emotional, the sensible and the eccentric—all who are genuinely religious are devoted to principles and concepts in which they have faith. It is integrating, unifying devotion which makes one religious. It is devotion of the whole self which causes a religionist to testify and labor in behalf of his convictions. Man's capacity for devotion is the universal and eternal factor in religion. This potential creative energy is evident all the time in the dominantly religious and in large numbers of people during a great war.

License fees may seem expedient to check annoying uses of devotion to queer ideas. War may be necessary to combat harmful uses of devotion to anti-human ideas. But neither license fees nor war will solve the problem of how to induce constructive use of it. Liberal religious leaders despairing of the feasibility of inculcating understanding and perspective in ordinary human minds, may feel inclined to think of the tendency for emotional attachment to beliefs as a liability, rather than an asset, to human well-being. Yet, now that great masses of people in many parts of the world are realizing the strength of united numbers, liberal religious leaders must choose between supporting the policy of outer control and encouraging the principle of inner constructiveness as a longtime attitude toward the power of ordinary people for devotion to ideas and ideals. Outer control is more practicable, but it is a denial of faith in man and in the scientific method of education. Constructive development of spiritual possibilities inherent in human nature necessitates freedom for religious effort by all who feel an inner urge to make such effort, understanding by them of values beneficial to mankind as a whole, and desire to realize those values. Training in the habit of scientific inquiry and in ethical behavior, especially in respect for individual personality, in the public schools and by other means, rather than indoctrination in patriotism, is needed to acquaint the multitude of ordinary people with universally valuable aims. Increased willingness to make effort for the achievement of these aims might be aided by better understanding of the desire for a consciousness of spiritual security and worth in human experience and of the power to achieve that consciousness through loyal devotion to satisfying ideas. Such understanding might be gained by religious liberals through appreciative study of the devotion of dominantly religious people. Appreciation encourages open-mindedness, which leads to improvement and correction of ideas, concepts, and ideals toward which devotion is directed. Appreciation frees, stimulates, and ennobles human souls. It unites religionists upon the bases of commonly held ideals and encourages coöperation in practical expressions of these ideals. Liberal religious leaders might seek opportunities for working in common causes with members of narrow sects, as well as with liberals whose viewpoints differ from their own. This period is rich in opportunities for coöperation in practical efforts by religious individuals and bodies whose beliefs are irreconcilable. Working together, like appreciation, opens minds and hearts to enlightening influences. A Humanist and a Nazarene, for instance, working together for the liberation of the Japanese in the United States, may help each other to come a little nearer to some spiritual truth.

"What the world needs," declares Arthur E. Morgan in the January *Standard,* periodical of the American Ethical Union, "is great commitment associated with the open mind. When these two traits habitually live together and mutually support each other we shall be well on the way to the good society. Those traits are not mutually exclusive." Effort for the union of open minds and devoted spirits is the only eternally open road toward the hoped-for love of truth and espousal of righteousness by a large majority of humankind. The appreciation of sincere religious effort expressed by Chief Justice Stone and Justices Murphy, Black, and Douglas, is of even greater value to true religion than their influence upon the law. The obligation to follow their leadership rests heavily upon liberal Christians, Humanists, Ethicists, adherents of Reformed Judaism, philosophers, and privileged religious individualists.

"You may disarm the hands but not the brains of a people, and to know what should be defended is the first condition of a successful defense."

James Russell Lowell—1898.

The Future of Organized Religion

LEO HIRSCH

Organized religion in Europe and the Western Hemisphere faces an ordeal more severe than any it has known for five hundred years. Society is at a great turning point in history, a crossroads point. One way leads to a genuine and successful social revolution with the possibility of a better social order. The other way ends with the frustration of the aspirations and demands of the masses.

If organized religion is to assume directional lead, it must find the answers to such questions as these:

1. How do present conditions affect the lives of fathers, mothers and children?
2. How do they affect life at its source?
3. How do they affect the community in which a family lives; and the relation of one community to another; nation with nation; race with race?
4. Can a social order based on justice rise on the foundation of the present social order with its devotion to the so-called profit system and of free competition?
5. Is religion consonant with imperialism; with war?
6. Is organized religion blameless for the ruthless persecution of the Jews and for the cruelties which have been visited on conquered countries?

The churches must face and answer these basic questions before they can begin to perform the social function. Spokesmen for religion have been generally ready to warn against the perils of what they called radicalism; but they seem seldom to have been aware that these perils develop because conservatism has dammed the stream of progress.

Is it possible to hope that there will be a change? It might be said that any judgment as to the outlook for organized religion will depend on one's conception of the nature and significance of the present situation. To those who believe that what is going on now is no more than a surface disturbance, an indication of an unrest that can be alleviated and satisfied by a reform program held within the framework of the present social order, the prospect for religion will be of one sort. To those who believe that the West is fast moving into a basic change of civilization—such a change as came with the disappearance of feudalism—the prospect of religion will be of an entirely different sort.

As to the greater number of churches and churchmen, it is my belief that there will ensue a retreat into the institution, a refusal to acknowledge the fact of the revolution—or, to put it more accurately, of the revolution's validity—and an intensification of devotion to historic formulas of worship that will persist as long as does the present social order itself.

The great tragedy that will probably befall Western religion in the near future will come out of the attempt of most of its followers to maintain their churchly practices as if society remained what it was during the prewar era. An attempt by organized religion in the West to make itself the spiritual voice of a new order of society might fail, but it would at least give the next years of life within the churches an heroic quality commensurate with their pretensions. What is likely to happen, however, is that those who have reason to fear for their *personal* fortunes during a period of vital change will insist on making their churches the last citadel of their allegiance to the past. All too likely they will cry out the defiance:

Come weal, come woe,
My status is quo.

Everything that has happened since the modern revolution began to rise from the ashes of the first World War points to the probability that organized religion will resist to the utmost the forces of progress.

The Russian Church committed suicide in resisting the forces of revolution. Religious organizations in Europe's Latin countries embraced Fascism rather than the revolutionary forces. The state religion in Germany embraced Hitler until he turned on it in his hate for all religion. The Füehrer would not have had a chance to dominate if German religious organizations had possessed understanding.

In the same manner, when revolution in the United States becomes organized and powerful, will like situations develop here? Will those who dominate our religious institutions make the same mistakes that were made in Russia, Spain, Italy, Germany? It is a question worth thinking about. However, it is more important for us to consider and discuss the future of those portions of Western religion that *are* aware of the strong current running toward social change and that are concerned to see that the religious institution shall make whatever changes are required to keep itself a vital, living force. The outstanding characteristic of this group is its sense of inadequacy. They represent, at best, minority groups. To persuade the majority to their way of thinking is an almost superhuman task. The resulting sense of personal inadequacy tends to make them irresolute. And yet, they feel that unless they succeed in giving new direction to their religious confreres, all religion, as we have known it in the Western world, faces catastrophe.

The thinking man is sure that the right direction is not the one which has its expression in the formation of a mystical community, in esoteric cults such as Buchmanism, Barthianism, even those which label themselves as Science groups with prefixes indicating the religions which the worshipers have forsaken. Such so-called religious movements bear the marks of escape mechanisms. They do not reveal any understanding of what is needed. In fact, they express the erosion of a whole culture. We all would be well advised to take such inventions as a warning, as a symptom. They are not a cure; they but indicate a need for a cure. Many have fled into these religious movements and will stay there.

That the tide of social revolution will rise is certain. Some of the adherents of present-day religious organizations will desire to proclaim a religion which will be integrated with the revolution. They will leave their present affiliations. They will feel unwelcome where they are now; likewise they will feel oppressed by a frustrating conservatism. But that will not mean that they desire to forsake the spiritual values of religion.

It is quite likely that religious institutions would rather see such men go than have them inside where they might influence others to their way of thinking. Yet, it is from those who welcome social change, whether their religious affiliations are within or outside formal religious organizations, that religious leadership must come. They will furnish the leaders against the time when it will be generally recognized that literal orthodoxy is moribund, and that fearless modernism, based on the modern sciences, must take its place.

These leaders will realize and make clear to others

that the problem will not be like that posed in Russia after her revolution, as between religion and irreligion, but that the real issue will be between supernaturalism and naturalism. All modernist movements point inescapably toward a sane Humanism.

The new leaders of religion will have to view society realistically and understand that in a large measure it is based on coercion. They will have to interpret history in the light of the past and the present, and understand that privileged groups never give up their power except when compelled to do so. Their major interest will have to be in forcing the religious community to recognize the hypocrisy in which it becomes involved when it passes adverse ethical judgment on any resort to coercion by the underdog, while it accepts—without effective protest—the coercion which the topdog—in almost every instance a "good churchman"—habitually employs.

These new religious leaders will have to be concerned with an attempt to save the future of religion by enlisting religion *now* on the side of the reorganization of society, for when the battle really gets under way at the coming peace conference and during the post-war period it will be too late. Then the pressure of the situation will force religion in on the side of reaction, and reaction's fate will attend it. These new leaders will have to be realistic and clearly understand that the reorganization of society, when it comes, will bring no Utopia but only a brighter, saner, more ethical social order.

Unless the new religious leaders become effective, it is no exaggeration to say: religion itself is doomed. If ever a time existed when religion had to prove itself in a realistic sense in the service of humankind, that time is near and now.

The new religious leaders will have to face the ordeal which confronts Western religious dogma. The leaders of the old religions frittered away their precious time with dogmas, theologies, ceremonialism, traditionalism, exceptionalism, and laid little emphasis on the supremely important part of religion, which is ethics, so that they have nothing to rely on today but the outworn dogmas to arouse faith and enthusiasm.

Can the religious symbolism of the past satisfy the insights which humanity will gain during these years of great suffering? The churches today are unable and impotent to state their beliefs with the old symbols with any cogency and conviction and thus far have been unable to develop new symbols adequate to meet the new experiences.

If these new leaders wish to correct these grave limitations of the churches, then the first step they must take in this regard is to bring a new consecrating influence into religious belief and must emphasize that the dedication cannot be derived from dogmas and theologies which, however important they may have been in the past, have ceased to be so for the masses of mankind. The present moral chaos and irresponsibility in the world today are largely due to the general attitude of the churches that the religious doctrine alone can produce morality. Righteousness, justice, mercy, compassion, love, coöperation, brotherhood are excellent on their own account and are independent from any doctrinal relationship. The ethical principle is supreme because it applies to all alike; it contemplates no favoritism, no special privilege.

Everywhere today in the western part of the world, two basic facts of ethical superiority are being remarked, by statesmen, by everyday folk, and by clergymen:

1. The preciousness and worth-whileness of every human being.

2. The freedom of the individual as necessary to growth and development. But only since the suffering of this war has this teaching come to the foreground. Lip service to these ethical concepts is not enough. They must be put into effect. And that is one of the supreme goals of the new religious leadership, which will come to truly make the individual free.

The ideal of the supreme worth of the individual is as far from realization as ever. The new leaders will have to make clear that, under the factory system and *laissez-faire,* the majority of humans become mere pawns in the economic battle. In fact, we all ought to know that our present social system could not possibly function if the idea of the supreme worth of the individual were seriously entertained.

Inevitably, economics enters here. Religion of the future cannot be a thing set apart. It will have to take its part in the economic world, or else it will have no part to take. The religious leader of tomorrow cannot be merely a scholar, merely a preacher. He will need to be a worldly-wise citizen, versed in the fundamental, everyday problems. He will have to understand the corporation, comprehend the problems of management, labor, mass production. He will have to be a keen analyst to understand where our devotion to the profit system has led us. Above all, he will have to realize and plan for an integration of freedom under economics and politics. For unless there is freedom in all, there is no freedom.

After nearly a score of years of Fascism and a decade of Nazism, it is beginning to be understood that both these forces are anti-labor, that they are basically directed against what are usually considered to be revolutionary forces. They are, in fact, counter-revolutions.

Organized religion did not at first understand this, it is not at all sure that it understands it now. Religious spokesmen dimly seem to comprehend that economic disturbance is the root of the world's trouble but are loathe to come to grips with the root problem. As they tried to rationalize slavery before the Civil War, they seek today to rationalize what is wrong. The so-called masses will not accept such rationalization any more; at least not for long. They are on a march of thought, as the armies are on a march in the field of martial strategy. They are determined to win their battle, no less than the generals are determined to win theirs.

Religion and democracy can flourish only when economic income is distributed so as to make possible a rising standard of living for all the people, and yet at the same time permit conflict. Freedom is only significant when coincident with it there exists a certain minimum of basic security that promotes human life.

The new leaders will have to teach their followers that democracy is not a system but that it is a principle of growth; that it rests on the long experience of the race that men do not grow, learn, and create except when they are free. Thus, the basis of democracy is individual freedom, embodied in our country in the Bill of Rights. Freedom in the large sense must always imply freedom from exploitation and want and insecurity. This larger freedom lives in the souls of men because men believe in freedom and are willing to face the *responsibilities* which liberty entails, because they are willing to make sacrifices that it may continue, be-

cause they are prepared to be courageous in choosing what is right and what is wrong.

Although Stanley High says this not a holy war, I believe it is in essence a religious war, a war between good and evil. This war is an expiation in blood and suffering for the evils we have been guilty of in our economic life. The atonement will not be complete until there emerges out of the flaming crucible a great regeneration, a more ethical, social, and economic order, the achievement of compassion in human relationships, international peace, and the right of every individual, every group, and every people to self-fulfillment.

Can organized religion be saved from complete disintegration? Yes, if the new religious leaders can develop a new ethical and religious principle that will express man's yearning for this wider and nobler freedom, and influence man to endure until it is achieved. Such an ethical principle would give man a new faith in the struggle. Such a principle could change the contemporary mentality and transform our system of values—it would mean the socialization of our conduct and the ennobling of our social relations. It is my profound conviction that this new principle will have to rest on the following theses:

1. We must have faith in man and in the powers of his reasoning faculty.
2. Man is the only instrument and agent in shaping the future course of society.
3. We must insist that we do not need to take society and its economic laws as something permanent and immutable.
4. For unity's sake, we must oppose all dogmatism and orthodox authoritarian religious movements; for they are opposed to democracy.
5. The Sabbath, society, the state, science—all these exist for man and must serve him.
6. Man's social intelligence must work toward a unified world-state.
7. In order to hasten the benefits of social coöperation and that it might serve all of humanity, it is essential that education be made available to all—the world over. Only thus can science, politics, religion, and economics be socialized, universalized, and spiritualized.
8. There looms ahead the supreme need of educating or adjusting human nature to meet the requirements of the emerging social pattern.
9. The explorers and discoverers of the future will work in the continent of the spirit. The imperative of our day is the recognition that the spiritual laws are the counterpart of the physical laws and are as inexorable, inflexible, and immutable. In the new world to emerge after the war, all leaders, religious and otherwise, must recognize the universality of spiritual laws as they apply to human beings.
10. Religion—intelligent religion—ought to be defined as an attitude toward life, implying as its ultimate goal human brotherhood, based on political, economic, and racial equality and justice.

Finally, this new ethical principle must find a way to integrate science, philosophy, and religion around a new faith,—a profoundly religious faith in man. Until a level of social integration or unification of the world's cultural patterns is attained, until we have an organ to centralize and coördinate the complexity of function of the emerging social organism, our humanitarian and religious aspirations will continue to suffer defeat.

Voices of Latin America*

I—Moisés Sáenz, Mexican Educator

JOHN H. HERSHEY

"We have been called bolsheviks, reds, socialists! It would be far nearer the truth to be simply called humanists," once declared the late Moisés Sáenz, eminent leader of education for the masses of Mexicans. Born in the city of Monterrey, in the northern part of Mexico, on February 16, 1888, he died in Lima, Peru, on October 24, 1941. Unlike many other prominent Latin Americans born in Catholic families, Sáenz was born in a Protestant family. He was educated in his native country, in the United States, and in Paris. He was at one time President of the Mexican branch of the Y.M.C.A., and was the first editor of an interdenominational Protestant magazine, *El Mundo Cristiano*. In 1926 he gave a series of lectures at the University of Chicago, discussing foreign investments in his country, Mexican laborers, and education. The lectures are part of a book entitled, *Some Mexican Problems*. In the field of diplomacy he represented his country as Minister to Ecuador in 1934, to Denmark in 1935, and to Peru in 1936. One year later he was made Ambassador to Peru. Writing of his personality, the artist, William Spratling, said that he was a rather tall man and had a decidedly pleasant manner. "His features are strong, with a broad forehead and the thoughtful eyes of a scholar."

Moisés Sáenz is known for his great work as an educator, particularly in the rural districts of his native land. He has held various educational positions in the Mexican government, and from 1925 to 1930 was Under Secretary of Public Education. Most of this period was under President Calles who ruled from 1924 to 1928. Sáenz led, along with others, in founding rural schools and missions throughout Mexico. The rural schools were not the conventional type, but rather community centers for the Indians and the mestizos. Adults as well as children participated. Not only were reading and writing taught, but also such practical arts as gardening, sewing, bee-keeping, weaving. The teacher was thus a social worker. The rural missions were institutes traveling from village to village with doctors, nurses, carpenters, agriculturists, and other experts. Their purpose was to train adults in the communities to become teachers. Professor John Dewey, writing of Mexico in his book, *Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World*, said that "there is no educational movement in the world which exhibits more of the spirit of intimate union of school activities with those of the community than is found in this Mexican development."

The Government of Mexico reported in 1941 that there are 13,358 primary schools, federally supported, 7,420 State and Municipal schools, 977 jointly supported, 991 trade and industrial schools, and 445 private schools. The total number of schools is 23,191, with an enrollment of more than 2,000,000 students

*The first of a series of articles on Latin-American leaders to appear from time to time in the columns of UNITY.

being taught by 46,653 teachers. In this connection it is interesting to note a part of an address by President Camacho on the subject, "New Trends of the Mexican Government for 1942," as reported in *Mexico News*. Speaking of education, he said:

> The cardinal ideas which inspire the Reglamentary Law of Education are: to implant in the pupils the concepts and feelings of social solidarity, emphasizing the importance of collective interests in relation to individual ones, so as to create an atmosphere about the reforms which will lessen economic inequality among men; to encourage whole-heartedly the cultural development of youth and make it fit for work in behalf of the common good, but always within a rigorously scientific spirit which excludes prejudices and rejects fanaticism; to develop a sense of national unity, and to instill through the school the love of country, of national traditions, of democracy and an understanding of the principles of human brotherhood; to prepare, in short, a generation to make better use of the riches which nature offers man and to share them more equally.

Article III of the Constitution of Mexico states the aims of education somewhat similarly, and is quoted as follows from *Mexico: A Revolution by Education,* by George I. Sánchez:

> The education imparted by the State shall be a socialistic one and, in addition to excluding all religious doctrines, shall combat fanaticism and prejudices by organizing its instruction and activities in a way that shall permit the creation in youth of an exact and rational concept of the Universe and of social life.

An important educational project, according to Sáenz is to integrate the Indians, of whom there are at least 2,000,000, into Mexican life. He believed that the Indians should not be isolated from the nation as they are in reservations in the United States. Instead, they should be brought into the national community and made a part of it, without, however, sacrificing their peculiar gifts and virtues. They ought to be given a fair chance and an equal share in national activities. Research in Indian life and communities was carried on by the Mexican educator in Guatemala, Peru, Ecuador, and Mexico. Sixteen millions of the total Mexican population of 20,000,000 are mestizos, that is, mixtures of whites and Indians. Practically speaking, Sáenz has said, the mestizos can be counted as Indian. He was sympathetic toward the "melting-pot" policy applied to these two races. The mestizo is racially the "true American," "the man of the New World."

In his outlook on economic and social matters, Sáenz was what we call in the United States a liberal, a progressive. He favored the raising of the material and cultural standards of the masses of the people. The power of the landed aristocracy must be broken and excessive landholdings abolished. Land must be given to the peasants. Workers should be organized. He opposed unprincipled exploitation of Mexican wealth by foreign imperialists, although foreign investors need not be excluded if they are willing to conform to Mexican laws. Natural resources must not be wasted by foreigners for their private gain against the public welfare. National wealth should be under the control of the government for the benefit of the people. Perhaps these views of the liberal-minded Mexican educator were the cause of his being called a bolshevik!

Humanism and Moral Leadership

EDWIN H. WILSON

The alleged iconoclasm, negativism, and even dogmatism of some early Humanists are an insufficient excuse for a certain institutional timidity toward the use of the label. The free mind often, and with some wisdom, attempts to steer clear of sectarianism of any sort. However, any effort to speak one's mind clearly and affirmatively implies a negation of the ideas with which these views collide, and all pioneering is inevitably unpopular.

For ten years and more the writer has sought to help stir the thinking of Humanists to the end that the movement be kept self-critical and creative, and that it grow in awareness of a common direction throughout its many phases.

Definitely related to this movement are not only those working in philosophy, education, and the social studies in the universities but religious liberals and Ethical Culture leaders. In Unitarianism, with or without the symbolic use of theistic terminology, naturalism prevails and self-labeled Humanists are more than tolerated. They work in unity of spirit with theistic brethren who accept the evolutionary world view and whose values are predominantly of the world that now is. But ever since the shadow of schism threatened the denomination, frightened denominational authorities have avoided the word *Humanism* whenever possible.

Ethical Culturists, similarly, with all their talk of moral courage sometimes go to considerable lengths to keep themselves unspotted by the Humanist label, though their views usually are not to be distinguished from those of representative Humanists. The otherwise fine article, "Pious Sceptics," by W. Edwin Collier, in the November, 1942, *Standard,* is a case in point. By implication this article identifies Humanism with rationalism and with "intellectual arrogance" but at the same time cites A. E. Haydon in support of one of its views without indicating that Professor Haydon also is a Humanist.

It would be a grave mistake if either of these organizations or any group of professional individuals, for the sake of institutional respectability or because of parochial astigmatism, should draw itself into an isolated shell or associate itself with authoritarian or irrational trends to the theological right. The fact is that broader than any modest institutional expression of Humanism thus far achieved is a world-sweeping movement of thought that has naturalistic foundations and is humanist in its moral values. It is implicit in the effort to marshal the forces of science to the task of producing a higher standard of human living here on earth. It is found wherever human intelligence and cooperation are supported by the faith that they are potentially adequate to establishing human happiness and peace on earth.

A movement is not to be judged by its lowest but by its highest denominator, and it is an unworthy policy that fails to measure forces in terms of their best exemplars. Now is the time for men of good will to rally their forces in an irenic spirit of cooperation to give moral guidance to humanity on a level high above sectarianism or the tyranny of labels. Sylvanus Duvall is right in this. To fail to do so now, in this valley of decision, is to consign the profession or organization to which one adheres to a moribund moral isolationism.

Individuals and associations should seize the great opportunity of the times to point the way to the common man the world over to higher standards and values of life. May every Humanist resolve now that the faults which grow up around endowed institutions shall not soon creep up to choke the courage and vitality of its mission. Were Unitarians and Ethical Culture leaders alike to measure up to the vision of the Free Religious movement, to which among others Ralph Waldo Emerson once belonged, and which represented the endeavor of progressive men to bring "ethics to the front," their leadership in this troubled decade would be known to the intelligentsia everywhere, as of a certainty it is not now known.

Is a Democratic Collectivism Possible?

VICTOR S. YARROS

Many enlightened students of social problems are convinced that the next social order will be socialistic or collectivist in character. Capitalism is manifestly bankrupt; the war is merely hastening its inevitable downfall. If the United Nations win, and our humanistic civilization is saved, progress will be the watchword of the next several decades, and democracy will resume its forward movement. In the economic sphere this can mean but one thing—the extension of collectivism.

But what of the political, intellectual, and moral spheres, it will be asked. Not a few liberals assert that collectivism is inimical to freedom, to rational individualism, to spiritual values. Collectivism spells concentration of governmental powers, and power is likely to be abused. Absolute power, Lord Acton said, begets absolute corruption. If an all-powerful state controls the means of production, it is argued, no critic of the government can expect a job. The state as employer of labor is more tyrannical, more arrogant and arbitrary than any corporation or utility. A totalitarian state does not recognize the right to strike or to bargain collectively. Political liberty loses all its meaning then, and so does religious and scientific freedom. The liberal, therefore, it is contended, cannot possibly favor a completely socialized economy.

Writers like Walter Lippmann and John Chamberlain have been harping on this theme for years, insisting that Socialism beyond a certain point is fatal to everything we cherish in our democratic system. Chamberlain, impressed by Russia's experiences, advocates what he whimsically calls "a permanent NEP"—a policy which tolerates several forms of industrial organization—collectivism, regulated semi-public monopoly, competitive and free enterprise, cooperatives, and so forth. Such a system, obviously, would tend to prevent or check greed and rapacity, protect the consumer, and afford the employe, the labor union, and the group considerable choice.

There is much to be said for such a system, though it is doubtful whether it has the elements of stability and permanence. The trend under it would be toward increasing collectivization duly and adequately insured against the evils feared by libertarians. The point to be stressed here is that if Socialism is to develop gradually, and not be precipitated by catastrophe and revolution, the dangers associated with totalitarianism will necessarily be avoided. Competition and free enterprise will remain in large areas of the new economy if we contrive to dispense with dictatorships, violent expropriation, unplanned and undesired dislocations. Evolution in economic affairs and relationships precludes total collectivization at one stroke.

Let us, however, face squarely the question which, as just said, has been very earnestly discussed by sincere progressives—namely, the preservation of liberty and opportunity under a system predominantly collectivist. Nothing is gained by ignoring or minimizing the seriousness of this problem.

In dealing with it honestly, the first point to be made is that those liberals who assert that collectivism kills liberty have not, thus far, advanced any substantial proof in support of their view, mistaking strong language for argument. Their references to Soviet Russia under the Lenin-Stalin regime are hardly relevant or persuasive. Russian totalitarianism is a product of war, chaos, and political immaturity. Russia has not felt secure at any moment since the Bolshevik revolution, and insecurity, plus active preparations for foreign attacks, always and everywhere militate against liberty. In Russia, in other words, collectivism was bound to assume totalitarian forms.

Some writers draw horrendous lessons or warnings against collectivism from the medieval regulations of industry and trade. They forget that the alternative to collectivism now is not more competition and freer private enterprise, but more rigid and more powerful corporate monopoly. To oppose the extension of collectivism is not to enhance the protection enjoyed by the individual or the minority; it is to strengthen the dominant plutocracy. In a democracy, the government is restrained by various checks and limitations, but the plutocracy is not subject to checks and balances. The economic royalists do not have to reckon with primaries and elections, or with the judicial veto upon legislation. We can separate the powers of government; we cannot separate economic power under modern technology from finance capitalism.

The dread of collectivism is a survival from the discredited *laissez-faire* philosophy of politics and government. Today the enemy is the irresponsible plutocracy, not the central government.

However, collectivism has its drawbacks and dangers, and its need of safeguards and guaranties against oppression and tyranny by the government in its capacity as employer and owner of the means of production. This being freely conceded, the question arises: What sort of safeguards and guaranties are possible in the light of modern and contemporaneous experience?

The answer is that we *have* of late devised theoretically sound and practically effective safeguards. No longer are government and bureaucracy, synonymous terms. No thoughful person likes or trusts bureaucracy. A bureaucratic collectivism unquestionably involves red tape, inefficiency, inertia, routine, dislike of innovation. We must, then, reduce the bureaucratic element to a minimum. Collectivism *must* be made democratic, vital, dynamic, progressive. And we know

that this is not impossible, or even particularly difficult. New techniques and new machinery have been developed and utilized by democratic governments with gratifying results. The duty of libertarians is to recognize these facts and, as collectivism spreads, take appropriate steps to avert the known dangers. Marx utterly failed to suggest such steps. He shirked the whole problem. He predicted the expropriation of the capitalistic proprietors and the organization of a socialist state by the dictatorship *of*—in reality *for*—the urban proletariat. The bourgeois or plutocratic state, he was sure, would "wither away." Just how the dictatorship would liquidate itself, or submit to liquidation at the hands of others, he neglected to tell us.

However, of this grave sin of omission, the Fabian Socialists, the Guild Socialists, the Syndicalists, and other collectivist schools have not been guilty. Those liberals who regard collectivism and totalitarianism as synonymous are not intellectually honest enough to do justice to the schools mentioned and to consider seriously the safeguards they propose. What are these?

In the first place, the T.V.A. strikingly exemplifies the new technique, the new form of industrial organization, referred to above. The employes of the T.V.A. are *not* hired by "the state." They cannot be arbitrarily fired by any bureaucrat or politician. They work under a merit system. They have rights, including the right to strike. They are employed by a public corporation "not for profit." They are free citizens of a free, democratic community. The corporation is directed and managed by public-spirited experts appointed by the President.

The application of the basic principles of the T.V.A. to *any* industry taken over by the state is favored by all libertarian collectivists. The railroads, for example, could be operated by a corporation not for profit, directed and controlled by experts without the slightest concession to politics or the vicious spoils system. The same is true of commercial aviation, of the merchant marine, of electric light and power, of coal and oil.

The full significance of the T.V.A. in relation to the coming collectivist social order is realized by but few thinkers, to be sure, because politicians and reactionaries have dwelt on its faults, actual or imaginary. Aldous Huxley, in his book, *Ends and Means*, reveals a rare comprehension of the elements of novelty and promise in the T.V.A., and he also bespeaks attention to the Port of New York Authority and the London Transportation Authority as embodying substantially the same elements. Even if the new agencies or instrumentalities in question are not perfect, because of political interference or bad traditions, it cannot be denied that they point the way to the right methods of dealing with collectivized property and eliminating the objectionable features of bureaucratic administration and management.

At any rate, it is now clear that Socialism is not necessarily state or bureaucratic Socialism. Collectivism has learned much from the criticisms and proposals of the anti-Marxian and post-Marxian schools of Socialism. And they will learn more and more, since no enlightened thinker today favors totalitarianism or regimentation, and since the pseudo-scientific apostles of Fascism and Nazism and their wretched fallacies and absurdities no longer deceive any one. We shall insist on freedom as well as on security, efficiency, and scientific management of industry. Despite the dogmatism of the old-style liberals to the contrary, we *can* have both a sound and just economic system and freedom in thought, letters, art and social life. In the words of Carl Dreher in his book, *The Coming Showdown,* while the inevitable result of technological changes will be collectivism, "as between democratic and Fascist collectivism, if our people are allowed to reach an understanding of the issues, and to choose, [there is] no doubt what the decision will be."

An American type of Fascism is not impossible of course, but education of the right sort will arrest the growth of Fascism and facilitate the establishment of a free, democratic collectivism. It is the business of genuine liberals, as well as of sober-minded and informed collectivists, to provide the proper education. It may be later than many think, but it is not too late. The chaotic world revolution *can* be guided and directed toward evolutionary, free, civilized collectivism.

The Study Table

Tragedy Speaks for Itself

THE SEVENTH CROSS. *By Anna Seghers. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 338 pp. $2.50.*

That American literary critics and reviewers should have placed *The Seventh Cross* third on their list of 1942's best fiction is a modest tribute to one of the most powerful novels that has been written about the concentration camps in Hitler's Germany.

An interesting comment on this novel was made to me the other day by a German refugee who escaped, by the skin of his teeth, from Hitler's Gestapo, in the year of the Roehm purge. Returning the book to me, he confessed:

> I have rarely read a more thrilling book. It is so real, so accurate in its picturing of present-day Germany, its concentration camps, its cruel masters and cowed people, and also so truthful in reporting the courage and persistence of those who even today remain unbowed and uncowed by the ever-present terror, that I found myself compelled again and again to lay the book aside. To one who has known the daily imminence of danger from Gestapo and S. S. as I have, who has gone through the agony of having to suspect even his friends for fear that they might become informers and traitors, who has lived in the very shadow of imprisonment and torture, the book was like the unfolding of a nightmare from which I had just escaped.

This is the story of seven prisoners who made their escape from the Westhof concentration camp. Chief among them are one Wallau, a former leader of the anti-Nazi movement, and George Heisler, who is the real hero of the story and whose final and almost miraculous escape makes this one of the most exciting adventure stories ever written. Fahrenberg, the camp commander, a typical Nazi brute, takes the escape of the seven prisoners as a personal affront to his dignity and person. Expecting the early capture of the seven, he has seven plane trees clipped, cross-boards nailed to their trunks, and these crosses studded with sharp nails against the points of which the returned prisoners are to stand until fatigue and weakness cause them to fall against the nails.

Of the seven, five are soon hunted down and re-

turned, among them Wallau, whose dreadful fate is described in almost revolting details. It is the fate of George Heisler, however, that is of chief interest. Another of the seven dies just as he is approaching his home village and preparing to avenge himself on the man who caused his arrest. But the seventh cross, intended for George Heisler remains empty and the victim prepared for it by the fiendish imagination of Fahrenberg manages to escape from Germany through the coöperation of an underground movement which, we have good reason to believe, it still functioning, and often very efficiently, in Hitler-bossed Germany. Remarkable about this story is its complete objectivity; the author indulges in no ideological or partisan comment. She is not interested in interpreting for her readers the meaning of the events she so realistically pictures. She lets characters and situations speak for themselves. The grimness, horror, and tragedy unfolded in these pages need no further elaboration than the personalities of the people that suffer, hope against hope, and somehow manage to infuse their own personal tragedy with a vein of triumphant faith.

The translation by James A. Galston seems to limp in places, but on the whole it has well caught the majesty of human suffering and heroism, and the grandeur of the "little people" who shall yet prove to be the authors of Hitler's undoing.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

This Man William James

WILLIAM JAMES, THE MAN AND THE THINKER. *By Max C. Otto and others. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. 147 pp. $2.00.*

This book contains the addresses delivered at the University of Wisconsin in celebration of the centenary of the birth of William James. The atmosphere of the actual meeting is carried over through the inclusion of the introductions, and by the fact that the writing, prepared for oral presentation primarily, tends to have a directness and a sense of intimacy, a conversational texture, that is just as desirable on the written page as on the platform.

James was a germinal thinker, a pioneer and inaugurator in philosophy. Standing at the beginning of the philosophical trend that has come to be known as typically American, he had great influence and attractiveness to the young men of his day. The men who have contributed to this volume are among the foremost of those whom James taught and stimulated, and many of them have developed certain of James' ideas to maturity. The reader may feel that these men should have taken sharper issue with James on controversial issues, which are either only mentioned or treated very briefly. However, the spirit of the occasion was one of appreciation and celebration, rather than that of fault-finding analysis. This book is primarily constructive and positive, pointing out James' leadership in the past, and the promise that his ideas hold for tomorrow.

If there is a central thread running through the essays, it would seem to be an emphasis on the sense of uniqueness, variety, freshness, and reality which James found in life. As M. C. Otto describes it, James "took as his subject matter the fulness of experience in all its wealth of detail and complexity of interrelation, in all its voluminousness and organization." The meaning of this characteristic in James points in different directions for the various speakers. Otto sees it leading to a distinctive philosophy, a new world view. Here is the germ of the philosophy of pragmatism, a new theory of knowing and interpretation of reality. Dickinson Miller points out that here we have a philosophy which is the natural complement of the method of science, embodying a like spirit and orientation to the world, the "method of social coöperation in thought." Norman Cameron sees in the psychology of James an approach opposed to that of Freud which will in time supersede the Freudian emphasis. Freud exemplified in psychology the same type of fixed, rationalistic, absolutistic attitude which James sought to overthrow in philosophy. Psychology is returning from the strange region of the subconscious to the familiar, everyday world in which James lived.

The lecture of John Dewey is the shortest, but perhaps the most pregnant, of the series. Dewey insists that we still have no adequate philosophy of democracy which enlightens the social connections necessary to communal life, the relationship between liberty and union, but he says that "James both points the way and issues the challenge." It is interesting that in Dewey, Bode, and Otto we have three of the foremost of the philosophers of democracy of our times, all three in the James tradition.

Boyde H. Bode dwells on the contribution of James to the problem of values and our need to "fashion our standards of truth, goodness, and beauty out of the raw material of experience." James is the philosopher of the pioneer and frontier spirit. J. Seelye Bixler points to James as the artist, the man of feeling, the unphilosophical philosopher, who combined impassioned outreach with logic. Bixler's essay does not strike this reviewer as being as creative a contribution as were some of the others. He fails to deal adequately with the rather dubious elements in James' theism, perhaps because he is too close to such interpretations himself. One would have liked to see what Otto or Dewey would have done with James as a religious thinker.

This book is a summary, an estimation, of a man and his thought. In some of Dickinson Miller's personal reminiscences one gets a vivid picture of the character and personality of James the man. In a very real sense this volume catches the spirit of a man and vigorously communicates his thought. It is rich in deep and invigorating appreciation, looking forward to the time when the germinal and invigorating thought of this man William James will be even more deeply influential and functional in our personal lives and our national and world-wide social life than it now is. Here is philosophy to live by and to grow by.

KENNETH L. PATTON.

Edith Stone Thompson

Edith Stone Thompson, wife of the Reverend George L. Thompson of Randolph, Massachusetts, passed away on December 2, 1942.

Modestly avoiding public life, Mrs. Thompson was devoted to all good causes, and her contributions to the peace and temperance movements were noteworthy.

In her earlier life she was a teacher in the public schools of Springfield, Vermont. Her cultural acquirements included an exact knowledge of the Greek and Latin classics and a wide range of English literature.

Always greatly interested in social progress and liberal religion, at the time of her death she was especially concerned in the upbuilding of a better post-war world.